

Appl. No. 10/813,410
Amdt. Dated Nov. , 2007
Reply to Office Action Mailed Aug. 15, 2007

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in response to the Office action mailed Aug. 15, 2007. Applicant appreciates Examiner's thorough search and consideration of the application.

Claims 1 and 3-11 were pending in the present application before the Amendments as set forth above. Claims 1, 8 and 10 have been amended.

Support for the amendments set forth above can be found in the specification, claims, and/or drawings as originally filed. Applicant asserts that no new matter is added. However, the claims are not limited to the disclosed embodiments. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103

By the Office action, claims 1 and 3-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thackston (US PG-Publication 2002/0035450 A1) in view of Yeh et al (US PG-publication 2004/0133498 A1, hereinafter referred to as Yeh).

In response to these rejections, applicant has amended claims 1 and claim 8 by adding more limitations thereinto, such limitations being sourced from the originally filed specification, claims and/or drawings of the present application. These amendments have been made at least for the purpose of overcoming the rejections. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections and allowance of the claims, as follows:

Claims 1 and 3-7

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

Appl. No. 10/813,410
Amdt. Dated Nov. , 2007
Reply to Office Action Mailed Aug. 15, 2007

'the specifications are transmitted to the electronic marketing system to be made public by the electronic marketing system, and the electronic marketing system is used for collecting basic data on those bidding companies wishing to bid on an outsourcing project and their respective quotations, and generating a list of the bidding companies'.

Applicant submits that any combination of Thackston and Yeh does not teach or otherwise suggest the invention having the above-highlighted limitations as set forth in amended claim 1.

Thackston discloses databases 210 connected with a NICECAD server system 200 (FIG. 2), "one or more prime contractor user systems 220 may comprise future variations of such systems that permit the interaction over a network with a server system" (paragraph 0068), and "one or more supplier user systems 230 may comprise any system that may interact with the NICECAD server system 200 over a network 260" (paragraph 0070).

As indicated above, the supplier user systems described by Thackston only teach the connection between the supplier user systems and the NICECAD server system. However, Thackston does not teach or suggest any function of the supplier user systems. Further, each of the supplier user systems of Thackston cannot properly be equated with the electronic marketing system of amended claim 1. As recited in amended claim 1, the electronic marketing system can collect basic data on bidding companies wishing to bid on an outsourcing project and their respective quotations, and generate a list of the bidding companies, which features are supported by paragraph [0019] of the originally filed specification, and are not disclosed or taught in the supplier user systems of Thackston at all. Accordingly, Thackston fails to teach or suggest the features of *'the*

Appl. No. 10/813,410
Amdt. Dated Nov. , 2007
Reply to Office Action Mailed Aug. 15, 2007

specifications are transmitted to the electronic marketing system to be made public by the electronic marketing system, and the electronic marketing system is used for collecting basic data on those bidding companies wishing to bid on an outsourcing project and their respective quotations, and generating a list of the bidding companies', as set forth in claim 1. That is, applicant asserts that each user computer comprising the standard parameter setting module in claim 1 is patentably distinct from each of the supplier user systems of Thackston.

Furthermore, Yeh does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted features either. Applicant submits that any combination of Thackston and Yeh does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted features either.

Accordingly, neither Thackston nor Yeh provides any teaching, suggestion, or motivation that it could be combined with the other to yield the inventive system as currently set forth in amended claim 1. That is, amended claim 1 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Thackston in view of Yeh. Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claims 3-7 depend directly from claim 1 and incorporate additional features therein respectively. Accordingly, claims 3-7 are also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Thackston in view of Yeh. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of claims 3-7 are requested.

Claims 8-11

Claim 8 is a method claim that recites limitations similar and corresponding to those of claim 1. Such limitations include *transmitting the specifications to an electronic marketing system to be made public by the electronic marketing system; receiving quotations from bidding companies by the electronic marketing system; [and] generating a list of*

Appl. No. 10/813,410
Amdt. Dated Nov. , 2007
Reply to Office Action Mailed Aug. 15, 2007

the bidding companies by the electronic marketing system. For reasons similar and corresponding to those asserted above in relation to amended claim 1, applicant asserts that any combination of Thackston and Yeh does not teach or otherwise suggest the above-highlighted limitations as recited in amended claim 8.

Thus, amended claim 8 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Thackston in view of Yeh. Applicant requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Claims 9-11 depend directly from claim 8 and incorporate additional features therein respectively. Accordingly, claims 9-11 are also unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Thackston in view of Yeh. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of claims 9-11 are requested.

In view of the above claim amendments and remarks, the subject application is believed to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

The Office Action Summary states that the present Office action is non-final. On p.8 of the Detailed Action, it is stated that the present Office action is final. Applicant requests that the present Office action be treated as non-final; and that upon the issuance of a final Office action, the finality of such Office action be clearly and unambiguously indicated.

Respectfully submitted,
Chang et al.

By 
Wei Te Chung

Registration No. 43,325
Foxconn International, Inc.

Appl. No. 10/813,410
Amdt. Dated Nov., 2007
Reply to Office Action Mailed Aug. 15, 2007

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive,
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: (408) 919-6137